

# School Curriculum, Assessment & Accountability Council (SCAAC)

March 19, 2013



---

## Volume 2, No. 1—Minutes from the March 19, 2013 Meeting

---

### ***Advisory Committee Members Present***

Holly Bloodworth  
Michael Borchers  
Roger Cleveland  
Linda Duncan  
Jana Beth Francis  
Jerry Green  
Thomas Guskey

Larry Hicks  
David Higgins  
Liza Holland  
Brenda McGown  
Phyllis O'Neal  
Terry Rhodes

### ***Call to Order***

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairperson Jana Beth Francis. A quorum of members was reached.

Others in attendance:

*Kentucky Department of Education:* Todd Baldwin, Todd Davis, Ken Draut, Robert Duncan, Roger Ervin, Kevin Hill, Karen Kidwell, Teresa King, Rae McEntyre, Kathy Moore, Rhonda Sims, Jennifer Stafford, Bridget Stanfield, Dale Winkler, and Joy Barr

*Others:* Richard Innes, Bluegrass Institute for Public Policy Solutions; Ben Lusk, Boone County Public Schools, Marcia Seiler, Office of Education Accountability

### ***Approval of November 13, 2012 Minutes***

Jana Beth Francis

Larry Hicks moved to accept the minutes from the November 13 meeting as presented. David Higgins seconded the motion. Motion carried.

### ***Unbridled Learning Update***

Rhonda Sims

Rhonda Sims provided an overview of the Unbridled Learning Accountability Model to serve as context for the next two agenda items. The assessment and accountability

model is a balanced approach that incorporates all aspects of school and district work and is organized around the Kentucky Board of Education's four strategic priorities: next-generation learners; next-generation instructional programs and support; next-generation professionals; and next-generation schools/districts.

Mike Borchers asked how the constructed response items in the 2012 end-of-course assessments would affect overall accountability. (In 2012, high schools completed end-of-course assessments that contained both multiple-choice and constructed response items. Effective February 2013, end-of-course constructed response items shifted from state administration to local administration, and will no longer be assessed as a part of the state's accountability.) Ken Draut said that when standard setting occurred in the summer of 2012, cut scores were determined based on the multiple-choice only, and then with multiple-choice and constructed response (a superscore).

### ***Next-Generation Professionals***

Todd Baldwin

Todd Baldwin shared with SCAAC members the progress being made with the Professional Growth and Effectiveness System. The PGES is designed to measure teacher and leader effectiveness and serve as a catalyst for professional growth and continuous improvement and is a key requirement of Kentucky's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) flexibility waiver and the state's Race to the Top Grant. A steering committee has been designing, developing and field testing the new system. Evidence from multiple measures will provide a performance level rating and inform a course of action to support the continuous improvement of practice. The continuum of performance for teachers/principals is four part: ineffective, developing, accomplished and exemplary. Todd Baldwin requested advice from SCAAC regarding two components of the PGES: 1) How should the percent of effective teachers and the percent of effective leaders be divided to provide the 10 percent component in the overall score for accountability?; and 2) In the measures for effective teachers, what is the impact on the student or set of students as measured by multiple sources of data over time?

Mike Borchers asked what was being proposed as the frequency of the teacher evaluations. Todd Baldwin stated that the plan was for every teacher to be evaluated yearly for the first three years and then every third year thereafter.

Larry Hicks agreed with the teacher measure of student growth as one of the multiple means to capture effective teaching.

Linda Duncan thought it would be helpful to know the total number of teachers and leaders in Kentucky before making a recommendation on the division. Holly Bloodworth and Liza Holland thought it should be a fifty-fifty balance, but Phyllis O'Neal disagreed and recommended a higher percentage for the teacher piece. The question also arose as to the definition of "leader." Is it a principal or any administrator?

Discussion continued around the idea of how many days should a student receive instruction from a single teacher to attribute student growth. State accountability is based on 100 days of enrollment.

After much discussion, SCAAC members requested more information be presented at the July meeting to assist in developing recommendations.

Break at 10:30 a.m.; resume at 10:45 a.m.

### ***Next-Generation Instructional Programs and Support***

Robert Duncan

Robert Duncan and Todd Davis presented an overview of the program review program. Diagnostic tools are now available online at AdvancEd. Support documents are available for entering program review evidence. June 1 is the district deadline to submit program reviews to KDE. Ken Draut asked that SCAAC recommend a proposed method for calculating the program review scores individually by subject. It is given that the three program reviews each have four standards, various demonstrators and characteristics, 0-4 point scoring rubric and each program review is to maintain equal emphasis or weight. At the November SCAAC meeting, it was recommended that the logical proficient mark be 8 on a scale of 0-12 for each program review. Based on that 12 point scale, a 10.8 would equal distinguished. In order to keep the distinguished points from skewing the final score, there could be a rule stating that at least 3 of the 4 scores have to be at least scores of 2. By using this additional rule, it would demonstrate that a school had at least 3 of the 4 standards in the average proficient range.

Linda Duncan made a motion for SCAAC not to recommend the use of the “additional rule” to keep the distinguished points from skewing the final score and demonstrating that a school had at least 3 of the 4 standards in the average proficient range. Liza Holland seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Ken Draut asked that SCAAC consider the proposed final calculation of mixing the next-generation learner and the next-generation instructional programs and support into the assessment and accountability model to give a single score. The weights are 77% next-generation learner and 23% program reviews. To compute, the program review scores need to be turned into a scale of 100. The conversion would be to take the total points on a scale of 0-36 and divide the points by 24, with 24 being the logical score point for proficient.

Phyllis O'Neal made a motion for SCAAC to recommend the calculation of using the proficient score of 24 to convert the total points of the program review into a scale of 100. Holly Bloodworth seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Ken Draut gave an overview of the program reviews and the phase in for accountability reporting for 2013. Schools will receive three independent accountability scores in the

summer of 2013: 1) Accountability scores for next-generation learners, year 2; 2) Program Review classifications; and 3) A new set of combined goals for 2014.

### ***Middle School End-of-Course Assessment***

Ken Draut

Ken Draut reminded the SCAAC members that in November it was recommended that KDE bring additional information to the council regarding end-of-course testing at grade 8. A solution might be to bank grade 8 end-of-course scores until the following year (grade 9). At that time, the student score would go to the high school that had the student for a full academic year in grade 9 (enrollment for 100 instructional days). The receiving high school would accept the course as a graduation requirement and therefore the score should follow the course credit at the high school.

Liza Holland made a motion for SCAAC to recommend banking grade 8 end-of-course scores until the following year (grade 9) using the four current end-of-course subjects. Brenda McGown seconded the motion. Motion carried.

The group broke for lunch at 12:00 noon and resumed at 12:45 p.m.

### ***College/Career Readiness Update***

Dale Winkler

Dale Winkler presented a college and career readiness update. He shared that much work is underway to create more opportunities for all students to become college and/or career ready.

### ***Curriculum and Assessment Updates***

Ken Draut

Karen Kidwell updated the SCAAC members on the progress being made with new science and social studies standards. The revised science standards are scheduled for review the end of March with the first read presented at the April Kentucky Board of Education meeting. A team has been working to revise the social studies standards with a draft ready for review in April and a first read presented at the August KBE meeting. Ken Draut also provided an update on the two national assessment consortia—Smarter Balance and PARCC—and Kentucky's participation. Kentucky is a participating member of PARCC and is following their efforts.

### ***Adjourn***

Jana Beth Francis

Topics for the next SCAAC meeting were requested. Mike Borchers moved that the meeting adjourn at 1:30 p.m. Liza Holland seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, July 16, 2013